The undersigned certifies that this correspondence is being sent via first-class mail with adequate postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, this 14th day of August 2006.

Linda S. Evans

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Chen et al.	Atty Docket No.:	PRD2045NP-US
Serial No.:	10/786,478	Art Unit:	1647
Filed:	February 25, 2004	Examiner:	Ian D. Dang
For:	Relaxin3-GPCR135 Complexes And Their Production And Use	Confirmation No.:	1497

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed July 12, 2006 setting forth a restriction requirement, Applicant submits the following remarks for consideration. In the event any fees are required for the filing of this response, including in connection with any necessary extension of time (for which Applicant hereby petitions), please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 10-0750.

Claims 1-30 are pending.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner set forth a requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 restricting Applicant to one of the following inventions: (I) claims 1-10; (II) claim 11; (III) claims 12-14; (IV) claims 15-17; (V) claims 18-25; (VI) claims 26 and 27; and (VII) claims 28-30.

Applicant hereby elects Group I, claims 1-10 , directed to a receptor-ligand complex. This election is without traverse with respect to the restriction requirement between the elected group and each of Groups II-VII.

Applicant traverses, however, the restriction requirement between each of Groups V-VII, because both criteria for a proper restriction requirement have not been met. For a restriction requirement to be proper, (i) the inventions defined by the claim groups must be independent and distinct and (ii) the consideration of the groups of invention in the same application must impose a serious burden on the Examiner. See 35 U.S.C. § 121 and M.P.E.P. § 803. In the present case, although the groups are directed to patentably distinct inventions, consideration of these groups together in one application would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner. As evidenced by the Examiner's search classification of the claims of Groups V-VII in the same class (435) and subclass (7.2), there would be no serious burden if restriction among these groups were not required. Accordingly, Groups V-VII should be rejoined.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests prompt action on the merits of the elected claims of Group I.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 14, 2006

Linda S. Evans
Reg. No. 33,873

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08933-7003
(858) 320-3406